

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 02235 01 OF 02 242117Z

70

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 IO-14 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03

NSAE-00 NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 SS-20

USIA-15 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 ACDA-19 AEC-11 OIC-04 OMB-01

COA-02 DLOS-07 CG-00 DOTE-00 DRC-01 /160 W

----- 052374

R 241845Z APR 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 5340

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 3919

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USMISSION GENEVA

AMEMBASSY VIENNA

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 2235

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: NATO, PARM, PFOR

SUBJ: CSCE CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES

GENEVA FOR CSCE DEL

VIENNA FOR MBFR DEL

REF: STATE 81134

SUMMARY: POLADS APR 23 MEETING WITH CBM EXPERTS FROM GENEVA COVERED AGENDA IN USNATO 1959. MUCH OF DISCUSSION CENTERED ON AREA OF APPLICATION FOR CBMS, WITHOUT CONCLUSION BEYOND NEED TO STUDY FURTHER WHAT PARTS OF EUROPEAN USSR SHOULD BE INCLUDED. DISCUSSION OF THRESHOLD, AND CATEGORY OF FORCES PLUS OTHER QUESTIONS OF DEFINITION INCLUDED IN PRIOR NOTIFICATION BROUGHT FORWARD NOW NEW VIEWS, ALTHOUGH UK AND OTHERS SHOWED CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 02235 01 OF 02 242117Z

ENHANCED INTEREST IN NORWEGIAN COMPROMISE FORMULATION COVERING THESE POINTS. ON PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MOVMENTS, ALL DELEGATIONS COMMENTED TO THE EFFECT THAT SOVIET PROPOSAL WAS UNACCEPTABLE AND THAT ALLIES SHOULD CONTINUE TO

HOLD TO PRESENT POSITION. US REP OUTLINED USG POSITION ON MOVEMENTS AS OUTLINED IN REFTEL. PARAS 22 AND 24 OF HELSINKI DOCUMENT DREW FEW COMMENTS BEYOND US REPS'S EXPOSITION ON DIFFICULTIES THAT NEUTRAL PROPOSAL CREATED, PARTICULARLY WITH REGARD TO MBFR. BALANCE OF DISCUSSION WAS DEVOTED TO QUESTION OF TACTICS AT GENEVA. FRG FAVORED MOVING FAIRLY SOON TOWARDS COMPROMISES IN AREAS WHERE THERE WAS FLEXIBILITY ON BOTH SIDES. OTHERS WERE MORE INCLINED TO LET NEUTRALS AND EAST BLOC CARRY BURDEN OF DEBATE, WITH WEST HOLDING FIRM FOR MOMENT UNTIL SOVIET INTENTIONS ARE CLEARLY IDENTIFIED. END SUMMARY

1. AREA FOR ADVANCE NOTIFICATION - POLADS DISCUSSED QUESTIONS OF CMM'S IN MARITIME AREAS ADJACENT TO EUROPE AND EXCEPTIONS FOR SOVIET AND TURKISH TERRITORY:

A. MARITIME AREAS - US REP DREW ON REF, POINTING OUT VAGUENESS OFFORMULATION IN NEUTRAL PROPOSAL, AND COMPLICATIONS FOR LAW OF THE SEA. FRENCH REP DREW SAME GENERAL CONCLUSION BUT THOUGHT "MARITIME APPROACHES" MIGHT BE ACCEPTABLE INSTEAD OF "ADJACENT WATERS." HOWEVER, CBM RESOLUTION SHOULD NOT SPECIFICALLY APPLY IN MEDITERRANEAN WHILE MAKING NO REFERENCE TO OTHER AREAS. ITALIAN POSITION WAS THAT RESOLUTION SHOULD NOT DESCRIBE AREA IN SUCH A WAY THAT OBLIGATION WOULD AUTOMATICALLY COVER INDEPENDENT AIR AND NAVAL MANEUVERS. FRG WAS FLEXIBLE ON INCLUDING MARITIME AREAS. NETHERLANDS DREW CONCLUSION THAT SOME ALLIES WISH TO HAVE SEA AREAS COVERED IN GENERAL FORMULA, BUT OTHERS COULD NOT ACCEPT FORMULA WHICH WOULD REQUIRE ADVANCE NOTIFICATION OF MANEUVERS IN CERTAIN AREAS, PARTICULARLY MEDITERRANEAN. AS A RESULT, NORWEGIAN COMPROMISE (GENEVA 270) WAS POSSIBLY THE BEST END RESULT OF CONFERENCE. BELGIAN REP AGREED AND DID UK. (SEE BELOW FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION OF NORWEGIAN FORMULA.)

B. EXCEPTION FOR SOVIET TERRITORY - FRENCH REP CITED US REPORT THAT SOVIETS WOULD BE WILLING TO NOTIFY MANEUVERS AROUND KIEV, AND CONCLUDED THAT THIS REPORT AND OTHER SOVIET SOUNDINGS REVEALED THE GENERAL LINES OF SOVIET THINKING. ALLIES COULD NOW PLAN SOME RESPONSE. US REP WARNED THAT SOVIETS HAD STILL NOT CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 02235 01 OF 02 242117Z

MADE ANY NEW FORMAL DETAILED PROPOSAL, BEYOND GENERAL CONCEPT OF ZONAL

AREAS, BUT OTHERS ARGUED THAT ALLIES SHOULD BE PREPARED IN NEXT MONTHS TO INDICATE WHAT MINIMUM COVERAGE OF SOVIET TERRITORY MIGHT BE. GENERAL CONSENSUS AT MEETING WAS THAT ALLIES SHOULD HOLD TO APPLICATION OF CBM'S "IN EUROPE" FOR TIME BEING, BUT IN THE END ALLOW FOR CERTAIN EXCEPTION OF SOVIET TERRITORY. FRG ARGUED FOR MINIMUM APPLICATION OF CBM'S TO THREE WESTERN DISTRICTS. TURKEY AND OTHERS PREFERRED MILITARY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION THAT MINIMUM APPLICATION SHOULD BE TO WESTERN MD'S, PLUS LENINGRAD AND TRANS-CAUCASIAN MD'S. UK WONDERED WHY, IF THESE FIVE MD'S WERE SELECTED, CBM'S SHOULD NOT ALSO BE APPLIED TO BALTIC AND ODESSA MD'S, SO AS TO RING FRONTIER AREA. IT WAS GENERALLY AGREED, ON

OTHER HAND, THAT EXCEPTIONS OF SOVIET-EUROPEAN TERRITORY COULD NOT BE FRAMED IN CSCE RESOLUTION IN TERMS OF MD'S, AND WOULD INSTEAD HAVE TO BE DESCRIBED IN TERMS OF KM'S FROM BORDER, LINES OF LATITUDE OR LONGITUDE, DISTANCE FROM URALS, OR SOME OTHER MORE GENERAL GEOGRAPHIC FORMULATION. BELGIAN REP PROPOSED FORMULATION TO EFFECT THAT MANEUVERS MORE THAN A CERTAIN DISTANCE FROM INTERNATIONAL FRONTIERS WOULD NOT HAVE TO BE NOTIFIED, AND MOST REPS SEEMED TO FAVOR THIS APPROACH, WHICH WOULD MAKE NO SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO USSR. HOWEVER, FRG AND ITALY OPPOSED EMBODYING REFERENCES TO PRESENT FIXED FRONTIERS IN ANY CSCE RESOLUTION.

C. TURKISH EXCEPTION - TURKISH REP SAID IT WOULD BE DIFFICULT TO FORMULATE EXCEPTION FOR TURKISH TERRITORY IN SAME TERMS AS FOR USSR. TURKEY WOULD WISH TO EXCEPT TERRITORY ADJACENT TO NEIGHBORS THAT ARE NOT CSCE PARTICIPANTS, WHILE EUROPEAN USSR CONTAINED NO SUCH TERRITORY. FOR TIME BEING, TURKEY COULD ACCEPT GENERAL FORMULATION "IN EUROPE" FOR CBM, AND WOULD NOT WANT TO GET INTO DETAILS OF EXCEPTION FOR TURKEY UNTIL SOVIETS HAVE AMDE THEIR OWN VIEWS MORE CLEAR.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 NATO 02235 02 OF 02 242208Z

70

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 IO-14 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03

NSAE-00 NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 SS-20

USIA-15 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 ACDA-19 AEC-11 OIC-04 OMB-01

COA-02 DLOS-07 CG-00 DOTE-00 DRC-01 /160 W

----- 053125

R 241845Z APR 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 5341

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 3920

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USMISSION GENEVA

AMEMBASSY VIENNA

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 2235

GENEVA FOR CSCE DEL

VIENNA FOR MBFR DEL

2. TYPES OF FORCES - AS A RESULT OF REVIEW IN LONDON, UK REP ADVISED THAT UK IS NOW PREPARED TO BE MORE FLEXIBLE ON TYPES OF

FORCES COVERED BY CBM RESOLUTION, AND TO ACCEPT ADVANCE NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR INDEPENDENT AIR AND NAVAL MANEUVERS, AT LEAST ON THE STRICTLY VOLUNTARY BASIS IN NORWEGIAN COMPROMISE FORMULATION. ADDITIONAL UK PROVISOS WERE THAT OBLIGATION WOULD ONLY APPLY TO PREVIOUSLY PLANNED MANEUVERS, AND THAT "MAJOR" WOULD BE LOOSELY DEFINED. GREECE, NETHERLANDS, BELGIAN AND CANADIAN REPS ALSO FAVORED NORWEGIAN FORMULA AS TO A WAY TO RESOLVE INTRA-ALLIED DIVERGENCIES ON NOTIFICATION OF INDEPENDENT AIR AND NAVAL MANEUVERS. ITALY, HOWEVER, REPEATED EARLIER OBJECTION, AND ADDED THAT NORWEGIANS APPEARED TO BE TRYING TO DISTINGUISH VOLUNTARY MEASURES FROM NON-OBLIGATORY ONES. US REP AGREED WITH THIS ITALIAN POINT, CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 02235 02 OF 02 242208Z

AND, DRAWING ON REFTEL, COULD NOT AGREE WITH SPECIFYING NOTIFICATION OF AIRBORNE AND AMPHIBIOUS MANEUVERS AND QUOTED FROM STATE 16559 ON CATEGORIES OF FORCES ON WHICH WE WOULD BE PREPARED TO GIVE PRIOR NOTIFICATION. FRG REP SAID ONLY DIFFICULTY BONN FINDS IN NORWEGIAN FORMULA IS IMPLICATION THAT FURTHER WORK WILL BE NECESSARY AFTER CSCE. NORWEGIAN REP REPLIED THAT THIS IMPLICATION CERTAINLY NOT

INTENDED, AND OTHER WAYS TO MAKE THE SAME POINT COULD BE CONSIDERED. HE SUGGESTED THAT POLADS GIVE FURTHER THOUGHT TO PROBLEM.

3. MOVEMENTS - POLADS GENERALLY BELIEVED THAT SOVIET FORMULATION UNACCEPTABLE. UK REP SAID CSCE RESOLUTION SHOULD INDICATE THAT HELSINKI STUDY HAD RESULTED IN DISAGREEMENT ON ADVANCE NOTIFICATION OF MOVEMENTS, RATHER THAN PAPER OVER ISSUE. MOST OTHER POLADS DOUBTED SOVIETS WOULD ACCEPT THIS SOLUTION. US REP OUTLINED CURRENT US POSITION ON MOVEMENTS WHICH LED ALL OTHER DELS TO CONCLUDE THAT THERE SHOULD BE NO CHANGE IN ALLIED HANDLING OF ISSUE FOR THE PRESENT.

4. TACTICS FOR GENEVA - UK TOOK HARD LINE, ARGUING THAT NO CONCESSIONS SHOULD BE MADE UNTIL LATEST POSSIBLE MOMENT. FRG IN CONTRAST FELT SOME INTERIM CONCESSIONS SHOULD BE MADE FAIRLY SOON TO AVOID ALIENATING NEUTRALS, AND TO KEEP UP MOMENTUM TOWARDS SUCCESSFUL CONCLUSION OF CONFERENCE.

5. POLADS COVERED OTHER ITEMS ON AGENDA IN USNATO 1959 IN DAY-LONG DISCUSSION, AND US REP COVERED ALL POINTS IN INSTRUCTIONS IN REFTEL, BUT DISCUSSION REVEALED NO CHANGES IN POSITIONS OF OTHER ALLIES. RUMSFELD

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 11 JUN 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 24 APR 1974  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** golinofr  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1974ATO02235  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1974/newtext/t19740482/abbryunh.tel  
**Line Count:** 208  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 4  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** STATE 81134  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** golinofr  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 21 MAR 2002  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <21 MAR 2002 by collinp0>; APPROVED <07 MAY 2002 by golinofr>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** CSCE CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES  
**TAGS:** NATO, PARM, PFOR  
**To:** STATE  
SECDEF INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS  
USNMR SHAPE  
USLOSACLANT  
USCINCEUR  
GENEVA  
VIENNA

**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005